

The man, looking over his shoulder and seeing that his pursuer was gaining upon him, rained blows upon the donkey, and the canter became a gallop. However, the curate was not to be denied, and soon overhauled his chase. To the man's evident terror he sped past the cart, seized the donkey's head, and brought it up short. "What do you want?" he gasped in husky tones. "You," panted his triumphant pursuer. "Who are you?" said the man. "Who do you think I am?" in turn asked the other. "*Ain't you the tax-collector?*" inquired the man. "No, I am not," said the curate. "Who then?" said the hawker, evidently much relieved. He was told, and a smile broke across his weather-hardened features. His donkey and cart were safe for that time.

The end of the curate's cogitations, as the result of his first year's work, seems to have been that the composition of a sermon even for a rustic audience was no easy task, nor one to be lightly treated. He determined to devote as much of his time as he could spare from other duties to the compilation of what should be useful to all sorts and conditions of men. Nor did he deem the time wasted if many of his evenings were spent in this study alone, how to speak so as to be understood of the people. "What do you do with yourself during the long nights?" once asked a fair friend of an intellectual turn of mind. "Write," said he, rather sententiously. "Oh! for the magazines, I suppose?" "N—no," replied the "curate, not for the magazines."

E. C. DAWSON.

---

## Correspondence.

---

### SHILOH.

To the Editor of THE CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—Permit me, of your courtesy, to make a brief reply to Mr. Hobson's criticisms.

He begins by stating that the question as to the interpretation of the "Shiloh" passage is not only philological, but is, "and perhaps mainly, a question of *external evidence*," MSS. versions, ancient comments on the text, and the like; and then he adds: "As proof of the uncertainty of the philological ground, Dr. Perowne, in your last, says of one of Dr. Driver's two proffered readings ('he that is his') that he 'should doubt whether such a rendering were *grammatically possible*,' and as interpretation, he says it is 'extremely obscure.'" There is here surely the most extraordinary confusion between philology, grammar, and interpretation. Philology, I had always supposed, was the science which dealt with

the meaning of words, tracing them back to their roots, whilst grammar deals with their inflections and construction. Besides, because I expressed a doubt whether a particular rendering of one word is grammatically admissible, what evidence is this that I had any doubt at all on the philological value of another? The philological question turns entirely on the possibility of taking "Shiloh" as a personal proper name derived from a root *shalah* (or *shalam*), and this Isay is absolutely without analogy in Hebrew. If Mr. Hobson has any doubt on this point, let me refer him to Tuch's "Commentary" on the passage, where the whole question is fully discussed; or to Rödiger's Supplement to Gesenius's "Thesaurus"; or to Dr. Driver's article in the *Cambridge Journal of Philology*; or to the Commentary of Delitzsch, who certainly cannot be accused of any want of orthodoxy. My doubt as to a particular rendering—not "reading," as Mr. Hobson calls it—of Dr. Driver's has nothing whatever to do with the derivation of the Hebrew word שִׁילֹהּ. It applies to quite a different word שִׁלְיָהּ which the Ancient Versions had before them. Dr. Driver gave what he considered to be two possible renderings of this word, and of one of these I doubted—I may have been wrong—whether it were grammatically possible. What has this to do with the question whether another word, *Shiloh*, is or is not a proper name?

But Mr. Hobson continues, "Let the facts be weighed." I desire nothing more. Unfortunately Mr. Hobson does not give us the facts. He says: "The earliest known Hebrew text is the *Massoretic*, at first traditional, then put into writing between the fourth and the sixth century (A.D.); and here the proper name *Shiloh* שִׁילֹהּ appears as the inherited reading." I am not sure that I understand Mr. Hobson's meaning. Does he mean that there were no Hebrew MSS. of the Old Testament before the third century A.D.? or does he merely mean that there was no settled text? and does he simply repeat the extraordinary blunder of the *Quarterly* reviewer, who gravely asserted that the Massoretes were a body of learned men who, some time between 300 and 600 A.D., sat down, and out of a number of MSS. before them culled what they considered the best readings, and so fixed the text? In either case the statement is contrary to the most certain "facts."<sup>1</sup> And pray what is the evidence that שִׁילְיָהּ was the "the inherited" reading, when it first turned up in the Talmud in the sixth century? How the reading שִׁילְיָהּ with the ' inserted came to be the generally accepted one in Hebrew MSS. we have no evidence to show. But it is certain that it was not the reading of the Targum of Onkelos—a Targum which was probably first committed to writing about the end of the second century A.D., but did not take its final shape till at least a century later—nor of the Jerusalem Targum, which was later still, and cannot be placed before the second half of the seventh century A.D. "The earliest version," says Mr. Hobson, "is the Septuagint, from which all known versions, except the Syriac, are derived." Unfortunately this statement also is not "a fact." The Samaritan Version was not made from the Septuagint, neither were the Targums: and Jerome, though he translated the LXX., also made a translation from the Hebrew, and he was not aware of the reading שִׁילְיָהּ, and his translation, it should be remembered, was made at the close of the fourth century. "No version has the reading *Shiloh*." This is a "fact," and one which to any unprejudiced mind must tell powerfully

<sup>1</sup> I may refer in proof to my reply to the *Quarterly* reviewer in the *Contemporary Review* for May, 1886, and to the Dean of Canterbury's papers in the *Churchman*, February and March, 1886.

against the reading. "All versions were made *before* the Massoretic Hebrew text was committed to writing, and yet this, the original language written by Jews, ignored all the versions, and gave the reading *Shiloh*. No one accounts for this striking fact." Again I must ask Mr. Hobson what he means? What does he understand by the Massoretic text? The text, I suppose he will answer, which is now generally received and supported by the greater number of MSS. But then he says this represents a text of *unknown antiquity*. If so, how comes it to pass that not one of the Versions knew anything of this most ancient text? How did the Jewish scribes succeed in keeping it so carefully from the knowledge of a single translator? and whence came that other text which they all followed? Again, what is the date of the earliest known MS. of the Pentateuch? and is it or is it not a fact that the labours of scribes first, and of Massorettes afterwards, were directed to doing away with all variations of MSS., and securing, as far as possible, a uniform text? *Omne ignotum pro magnifico*; and there really seems a disposition in many minds to regard the Massoretic text as having been dropped down straight out of heaven, or in some way supernaturally guarded from error. Yet this might lead those who attach so overweening a value to it to some unpleasant conclusions.

Let me invite Mr. Hobson to consider what the Massoretic text of Psa. xxii. 16 is. Would he be disposed to give up the reading of all the Versions which have a verb, "they pierced" or "they bound," or the like, for the reading of the Massoretic text and the great majority of the MSS. "like a lion"? Or does he think that the correction of "Moses" into "Manasseh" by the Jewish scribes, in Judges xi., in order to save the honour (as they supposed) of their great Lawgiver, is a justifiable correction? When Mr. Hobson adds: "The witness of the earliest versions is weakened by the very significant fact that whilst omitting the *Shiloh* reading as guided by the Septuagint and not by a Hebrew text, *they are not agreed on any other*, nor is any one clear and satisfying," I have only to repeat that the other reading, *Shelloh*, is vouched for by a Hebrew text, as well as by the LXX., for it is that of the Targums, and has even been adopted by some Jewish Rabbis, e.g., Saadyah and Rashi, that the variations are only slight, that the *sense* of all is pretty nearly the same, and is in all *Messianic*; and as for the want of exact agreement, it is no more than in Psa. xxii. 16.

Mr. Hobson argues as if the well-known passage in the Talmud were decisive proof that the word *Shiloh* was in the sixth century "the accepted text, and that it was interpreted as a proper name, meaning the Messiah." But even if it were the accepted text (which it was not, for Onkelos, the Jerusalem Targum and Saadyah have the other reading), it does not follow that the interpretation was what he asserts. For several of the Jewish Rabbis, it is well known, explained *Shiloh* as meaning "his (i.e. Judah's) son;" and so the mere quotation of *Shiloh* as one of the names of the Messiah is no proof that the Talmudists regarded it as a proper name, as it is quite certain that they did not regard *Yinnon* and *Chaninah* as proper names. They might have understood *Shiloh* to mean "his son" and still have quoted it as a name of the Messiah. And, if so, it is easily explicable how some of the Jewish Rabbis, not knowing what to make of the received text, שִׁלֹה (for this was, as the Targums show, the received Jewish text in ancient times), on any grammatical principle, inserted the ך and so gave the reading שִׁילוֹה, which many of them afterwards explained as above. This is, I think, a by no means impossible account of the matter, though I do not insist on it, but only insist on the facts (a), that the earliest Jewish reading was *Shelloh* ('whose'), and (b), that then the later reading *Shiloh* (with the ך inserted) was adopted by the Talmudists

and the Midrash that follows them. The Talmudic extract proves nothing as to the precise sense which they attached to *Shiloh*.

Mr. Hobson says that I object to taking *Shiloh* "as a name because it has no apparent reference to any office or character of Messiah." Certainly I do; and how does he meet the objection? By saying that there are many names in Scripture about the derivation of which we are uncertain. But the question is not about names in general, but names of the *Messiah*. Can Mr. Hobson produce any one of these about the etymology or signification of which there is any doubt?

But "a brief summary may show" that my assertion "that the *Shiloh*-reading has not tradition in its favour, is questionable." Thus, (1) "All earliest testimony, Jew and Christian, is for a *personal* interpretation of the text of Genesis." Granted:—I have insisted upon this myself, but it is wholly beside the mark: it is just as much in favour of the reading *Shelloh* as of the reading *Shiloh*. (2) "The traditional teaching is that *Messiah* is the subject of the text." This also I have maintained, but it is equally true whichever reading we adopt. And even this statement requires some modification, for the best-supported and probably earliest rendering of the LXX. is τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ, "Until the things which are reserved for him come." This is not a directly Messianic rendering. "For him" can only mean "for Judah;" as no one else has been mentioned; and this is a striking corroboration of the view I have adopted, that the *primary* reference of the passage is to Judah. (3) "The Masoretic reading, *Shiloh*, is *professedly* tradition, and of *unknown antiquity*." I answer, certainly the reading rests upon *some* tradition, but its meaning, as I have already shown, is very uncertain; and as to its antiquity, there is no evidence whatever of its existence before the sixth century A.D., whereas there is overwhelming evidence that another reading existed centuries before,—at least from the middle of the third century B.C. (4) "The greatest number of Hebrew MSS. have *Shiloh*." Granted,—but so likewise the greatest number of Hebrew MSS. have כְּאֵרִי ("like a lion") Psa. xxii. 16, and no known Hebrew MS. is of very great antiquity. (5) "The Talmud and Midrash have preserved extracts from *some earliest text*, with the *Shiloh*-reading in exact quotation, at a date far anterior to any existing manuscripts; and against all this there is not one other unambiguous reading, or one in which all the versions agree." To which I reply, where is the proof that a reading which first crops up in the sixth century is derived from *some earliest text*? We know that the other reading did exist for eight centuries before, and there is one unambiguous reading in which all the Versions agree, though they do not all render it alike.

Let me give my summary of "facts," which I venture to think will be found very much more accurate than Mr. Hobson's:

I. From the time when the Version of the LXX. was made (say, 270 B.C.) down to the Talmudic quotation in the sixth century A.D., the only reading of which there is any trace is *Shelloh*, not *Shiloh*. It underlies all the Versions.

II. Even at a later period, in the seventh and tenth centuries A.D., some Jewish authorities, as the Targum Jerushalmi, and Saadyah have still this reading, and do not apparently know of any other.

III. Many even of the Rabbis who accepted the reading *Shiloh* (with the *ו* inserted), nevertheless did not take it as a proper name; but, adopting a false etymology, interpreted it to mean "his [*i.e.*, Judah's] son."

IV. If others took *Shiloh* as a proper name, nevertheless it is quite certain there was no received and uniform interpretation current among the Jews.

V. From the third century B.C. to the sixth A.D. one reading is found, with some variation of rendering; from the sixth century to the sixteenth, there are variations both of reading and rendering.

These are the "facts," which I challenge Mr. Hobson to disprove.

But there is much more serious matter to come. Mr. Hobson lifts up both hands in horror at my audacity in venturing to question the soundness of the common view, on the ground that it is not supported by history. I have said that it is not true, as a matter of fact, that the sceptre did not depart from Judah before Christ came. How does Mr. Hobson answer me? He begins with the assertion, that "the best authorities, ancient and modern, have always held that, either under kings or governors (as the text reads), some governing power did remain with Judah till Christ came."

I wish Mr. Hobson would be a little more precise. Who are "the best authorities"? And how do they prove their point? Bishop Wordsworth, at all events, as I have already said in a former paper, observes: "It can hardly be doubted that for some time the *exercise* of the royal power in Judah was *suspended*;" though he proceeds to argue, very unsatisfactorily as it appears to me, that this fact does not militate against the prophecy. Mr. Hobson, moreover, does not make it clear whether he understands by "the sceptre" the tribal sceptre or the kingly; and he *assumes* the rendering "lawgiver," in the second clause of the verse, to be the correct one—though "ruler's staff" is now generally accepted, and has been adopted in the Revised Version.

Mr. Hobson says that "for 532 years from David to the Captivity *kings* reigned;" and then he shifts his ground, and says that "after the Captivity *Judah* (with the annexed tribes under him) was supreme over the whole land . . . and Jerusalem of Judah remained the seat of government, wherein was preserved the power of capital punishment until our Lord's day." Here we have the supremacy of the tribe substituted for the kingly sceptre by a stroke of the pen: and the subsequent history might have been sketched more accurately. The facts are, that during a period of somewhat over 200 years Judæa was a Persian province. Then for 163 years, from the fall of Alexander to the rising of the Maccabees, the Jews were governed by Alexander's successors. Then came the Hasmonæan princes, who, as Mr. Hobson reminds us, took the name of king; but who, he forgets to add, were members of the tribe of LEVI, and not of Judah. Is it too much to conclude that "a supposed fulfilment of a prophecy which ignores the dependent state of Judæa during 400 years after the destruction of the first Temple, cannot be regarded as based upon sound principles of interpretation"?

Finally, Mr. Hobson thinks my "summing-up is startling." I am glad he thinks so. A cold bath is sometimes invigorating. But I must protest against his mutilation of my words. He has omitted precisely those which give the whole point and force to my interpretation. Let me give the passage as it stands in THE CHURCHMAN for December, 1886, p. 152:

"When, it may be asked, was the prophecy fulfilled? Clearly in the reign of Solomon primarily. *Till then Judah had been the leading tribe, both before and after the settlement in the land.* In David's time Judah became the sovereign tribe. Under Solomon it attained to rest. And the Messianic idea is here bound up with the tribe as elsewhere with the nation. *All that pertains to the tribe pertains to it as culminating in the Messiah, just as all that pertains to the nation pertains to it as finding its highest expression in the Messiah.* Hence as St. Matthew sees a fulfilment of Hosea's words, 'Out of Egypt have I called My son' (Israel the nation), in an event in our Lord's life, so the Messianic vision of rest and peace and submission of the nations finds its foreshadowing in the destinies of the tribe out of which our Lord sprang."

Mr. Hobson omits all the words in italics, and then exclaims, "This is 'private interpretation' surely! The very centre of gravity of the Pro-

phetic word is boldly shifted." If it is "private interpretation," so is every interpretation of the passage, for there is absolutely no consensus of interpretation; and if the very centre of gravity of the Prophetic word is boldly shifted, then it is no more than St. Matthew has done in his quotation from Hosea. Mr. Hobson, like the *Quarterly* reviewer, seems never to have heard of the *duplex sensus* of Prophecy, which has been so amply defended by Davison and other learned divines. If Israel the nation was a type of Christ, then why may not Judah the tribe be a type of Christ? If the destinies of the one foreshadowed the history of the Messiah, why may not the destinies of the other foreshadow it likewise? If the vision is "seen through an inverted telescope" in the one case, it is in the other also. But, strange to say, Mr. Hobson does not stop here. He boldly proceeds to deny that Solomon was a type of Christ. "Surely," he says, "in that Eastern voluptuary's reign there was no *foreshadowing* of the coming of THE HOLY ONE OF GOD?" This is astounding. This is "private interpretation" with a vengeance. To whom of accredited writers will Mr. Hobson turn in support of such a view? Surely the seventy-second Psalm—surely the very name of Solomon, is a sufficient refutation of so "startling" a position.

"Well may Dr. Perowne say," remarks Mr. Hobson, in conclusion, "that his view 'lacks ancient support'!" Why does he not finish my sentence—"but so does any view which is consistent with the received Hebrew text"?—Mr. Hobson's as well as my own; and I am well content to leave it to the judgment of every competent scholar which of the two views contains "the essential elements of clearness, proportion, and probability"; and which, let me add, is most in accordance with "the facts," whether of the text or of the history.

J. J. STEWART PEROWNE.

DEANERY, PETERBOROUGH, Feb. 2, 1887.

---

## Short Notices.

---

*Daniel.* An Exposition of the Historical Portion of the Writings of the Prophet Daniel. By the Very Rev. R. PAYNE-SMITH, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. Pp. 335. Nisbet and Co. 1886.

AT the present time, when so much is asserted by representatives of "the Higher Criticism," in periodical literature as well as in volumes, inquiry is not unfrequently made among both clergymen and cultured laymen concerning the Book of Daniel. What really is that Book? When was it written? To such inquirers we would, in reply, recommend the volume before us, the work of an orthodox divine, about whose ability and erudition, and in particular about whose knowledge of the original languages, there can be no question. The work is chiefly expository; but here and there comes in a statement or a suggestion which will be of service to many whose minds have been perplexed. The exposition is as clear as it is full. Dealing only with the historical portion of the writings of Daniel, it is free from critical or scholarly disquisitions, and will be of interest to Bible students generally. The teaching of the "image" (ii. 33-38) is succinctly unfolded. "The head was of gold," writes the Dean, "and by this was symbolized the Babylonian monarchy." Daniel "next describes the breast and arms of silver." "The old commentators, all consider this to have been a prophecy of the Medo-Persian empire